

+



3643

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. 09/695,531 Application Number October 23, 2000 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL First Named Inventor **FORM** YAMASHITA, THOMAS T. Group Art Unit (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) **Examiner Name GELLNER, JEFFREY L.** Attorney Docket Number **800-AMAY** Total Number of Pages in This Submission ENCLOSURES (check all that apply) Fee Transmittal Form **Assignment Papers** After Allowance Communication (for an Application) to Group Fee Attached Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board X of Appeals and Interferences Amendment / Reply Licensing-related Papers After Final Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition Affidavits/declaration(s) Proprietary Information Petition to Convert to a Extension of Time Request **Provisional Application** Status Letter **Express Abandonment Request** Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Information Disclosure Statement Other Enclosure(s) (please Address identify below): **Terminal Disclaimer** Certified Copy of Priority **Documents** - Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. Request for Refund 1.132 for Thomas Yamashita Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application - Postcard CD, Number of CD(s) Response to Missing Parts Remarks under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm BRET E. FIELD, Reg. No. 37,620 Individual Name Signature Date April 4, 2002 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: April 4, 2002 Typed or printed name Martha Cisneros Signature April 4, 2002

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take .2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify the this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for North March 2021.

Typed or Printed Name

Martha Cisneros

Signature

Date

Date

## **REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111**

Address to: Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Attorney Docket	YAMA-008
First Named Inventor	Thomas T. Yamashita
Application Number	09/695,531
Filing Date	October 23, 2000
Group Art Unit	3643
Examiner Name	Gellner, Jeffrey L.
Title	Microbial Blend Compositions And Methods For Their Use

Sir:

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated January 31, 2002 for which a three-month period for response was given making this response due on or before April 31, 2001. In view of the remarks put forth below, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

## REMARKS

RECEIVED
APR 1 7 2002

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-20 have been examined and have been rejected.

**GROUP 3600** 

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1-20, the only claims pending in this application.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 10-13, 14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Reinbergen (WO 97/31879). The Applicant respectfully submits that the above cited reference does not anticipate claims 1-8, 10-13, 14 and 17-19.

Under current case law, a reference does not anticipate a claim unless "all of the elements and limitations of the claim are found within [that]...reference....There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of invention." Scripps Clinic v. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ2d 1671, 1672 (Fed. Cir. 1992).